UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,227	09/18/2003	Colleen Poerner	2002P15657US01	8462

7590 07/06/2006

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
TERMANINI, SAMIR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,227	POERNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Samir Termanini	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 September 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ~~8/3/04 & 8/26/04~~. 8/30/04 & 8/5/04
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

PRIORITY

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, applicant has provided inconsistent data with regard to actual filing dates, and further, as to which specific application(s) applicant intends priority under U.S.C. 119(e) to be claimed to.

2. The Oath/declaration only lists provisional application Serial No. 60/413,010, where the first lines of the specification read:

> CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS
>
> [0001] This application claims priority to and incorporates by reference herein in their entirety, pending provisional application Serial No. 60/412,917 (Applicant Docket No. 2002P1 5652US), filed 23 Sep. 2003 [sic], and pending provisional application Serial No. 60/413,010 (Applicant Docket No. 2002P15657US), filed 23 Sep. 2003[sic].

Please note that the filing year for both provisional applications are 2002, not 2003 as disclosed above. Even though both references were identified in the specification, and the Office as may have recognized the information concerning the benefit claim shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt, applicant is still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78(a) by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification or an ADS. See MPEP § 201.11.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

3. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and

legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the first few word comprise an implied phrase, "Certain exemplary embodiments provide..." Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

TRADEMARK USAGE

5. The use of the trademark "Pentium III" (line 1, pp. 9) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

6. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

DRAWINGS

7. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show, as described (e.g. in Fig. 1) in the specification, a:

Element(s)	**Numeral**
HMI	1110

HMI navigation engine	1120
user interface	1130
HMI user screen	1140
HMI screen navigation editor	1150
rendering	1160
information device	1170
navigation bar	6200
programmable navigation buttons	6220
"Back" button	6222
buttons	6240
Related components buttons	6226 and 6228
process graphic	6100

Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective

action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 7 is not limited to using a machine to carry out the method since it does not explicitly set forth how or what "determining an arrangement" is, nor how it is to be preformed. Accordingly, "If the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed invention as a whole encompasses a human being, then a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 must be made indicating that the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter." See MPEP §2105. The limitation of claim 7, "...determining an arrangement...", is directed toward non-statutory matter is because the step of "determining" can be carried out by a human being. This subject matter is not limited to that which falls within a statutory category of invention because it is not limited to a process, machine, manufacture, or a composition of matter. Instead, it encompasses a human being.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 1-12,14-19,29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Coburn et al.* (US 2002/0120921 A1).

As to independent claim 1, *Coburn et al.* teach a method for configuring HMI user screen navigation (HMI Editor 9804, para [0397]) comprising the activities of: providing an HMI screen navigation editor (HMI Editor 9804, para [0397]) to a user (the control engineer, para. [0676]); via the HMI screen navigation editor (HMI Editor 9804, para [0397]) enabling the user to create a collection comprising a linked hierarchically (A hierarchical list of the control assembly types 810, control assembly instances 820, and control assembly instance requests 830, para. [0758]) organized plurality of HMI screen nodes ("a plurality of different CAS will be provided," para. [0065]); and rendering the collection to the user (e.g. Fig. 14, 15, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 etc.).

As to independent Claim 33, *Coburn et al.* teach a machine readable medium containing instructions for activities comprising: (this product-by-process anticipated by the process of claim 1) via the HMI screen navigation editor, enabling

the user to create a collection comprising a linked hierarchically organized plurality of HMI screen nodes; and rendering the collection to the user. The only difference between claim 33 and claim 1 is that claim 1 is a method claim and claim 33 is a product by process claim. Thus, claim 33 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above and is rejected for the reasons set forth above.

As to independent Claim 34, *Coburn et al.* teach a device for providing a representation of user screens for an HMI comprising: (therein disclosed a block schematic diagram of a device, for example a personal computer system, in accordance with a preferred embodiment, see Fig. A1) an HMI screen navigation editor operatively adapted to: enable a user to create a collection comprising a linked hierarchically organized plurality of HMI screen nodes; and render the collection to the user. The only difference between claim 34 and claim 1 is that claim 1 is a method claim and claim 34 is an apparatus claim. Thus, claim 34 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above and is rejected for the reasons set forth above.

As for dependent claim 2, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from the user a specification (panel specification, para. [0853]) of an HMI root screen node ("master control panel" 2300, para. [0853]).

As for dependent claim 3, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from the user a specification of (where a user can define module specifications, para. [0819]) an HMI child screen node(child modules, para. [0820]), the HMI child screen node a descendent ("air" and "T1" modules would all be child modules of the parent machine

module., para. [0820]) of an HMI root screen node ("master control panel", para. [0820]).)

As for dependent claim 4, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from the user a specification of (HMI... specifications 9006, para. [0515]) a relationship between two of the plurality of HMI screen nodes (HMI linking table like table 2027 illustrated in FIG. 103.).

As for dependent claim 5, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from the user ("The template language guides a user to assemble" para. [0814]) a specification of an organization of the collection ("...programming units called modules a complete and correct machine tree 1611 para. [0814])

As for dependent claim 6, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from the user a specification of a hierarchy of the collection (where "machine tree 1611 [is] made up of the hierarchically-related components", para. [0813]).

As for dependent claim 7, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising determining an arrangement of the collection (In FIG. 16, the hierarchical relationship between the machine 1610 and the indexer 1620 is illustrated at the top portion of the machine tree 1611; See also para. [0808]).

As for dependent claim 8, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from the user a

specification of a size the plurality of HMI screen nodes (Attributes: Fixed Size, para. [0696].)

As for dependent claim 9, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising zooming a rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes ("An operator can zoom in to observe particular areas based on information from the enterprise to control large parts of the enterprise from a central control station," para. [0678]).

As for dependent claim 10, *Coburn et al.* teaches the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising panning (using scroll bars, para. [1295]) a rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes.

As for dependent claim 11, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising collapsing a rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes. (See collapsing hierarchical list of Fig 8.)

As for dependent claim 12, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising expanding a rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes ("expanded until virtually all tool movements are represented" para. [0792])

As for dependent claim 14, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising rendering a portion of a plurality of HMI screen nodes. (compiler compiles the schematic diagrams of the separate control devices, linking the devices according to a schematic rule set (SRS) to generate a complete schematic illustrating all...links therebetween." para. [0069])

As for dependent claim 15, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising enabling the user to

revise the collection. (including each mechanical resource in a mechanical block, para. [0068])

As for dependent claim 16, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising enabling the user to revise at least one of the plurality of HMI screen nodes (a separate CA for each type of mechanical resource that may be specified by a process engineer, para. [0066]).

As for dependent claim 17, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving a user specification of an attribute of an HMI screen node (Each CA includes several different [attribute] types associated with the specific CA, para. [0066]).

As for dependent claim 18, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving a user specification of an attribute of the collection (linking the devices according to a schematic rule set (SRS), para. [0069]).

As for dependent claim 19, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from a user a specification of a link between two HMI screen nodes (HMI linking table like table 2027 illustrated in FIG. 103.).

As for dependent claim 29, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one button the at least one button comprising an HMI screen link the at least one button activatable via a user-specified soft key ("...accomplished by using the keys on a keyboard to place the

cursor over the schematic symbol ...and press the button to toggle the symbol..." para, [0923]).

As for dependent claim 30, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising rendering a navigation control comprising at least one button, the at least one button comprising an HMI screen link, the at least one button activatable via a user specified soft key ("...accomplished by using the keys on a keyboard to place the cursor over the schematic symbol ...and press the button to toggle the symbol..." para, [0923]).

As for dependent claim 31, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one element activatable via a user specified soft key ("...accomplished by using the keys on a keyboard to place the cursor over the schematic symbol ...and press the button to toggle the symbol..." para, [0923]).

As for dependent claim 32, *Coburn et al.* teach the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above, further comprising rendering a navigation control comprising at least one element activatable via a user specified soft key ("...accomplished by using the keys on a keyboard to place the cursor over the schematic symbol ...and press the button to toggle the symbol..." para, [0923]).

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between

> the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 13 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Coburn et al.* in view of *Spriggs et al.* (US 6,421,571 B1).

As to dependent claim 13 *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that rotating a rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes is not taught. *Spriggs et al.* has been cited for teaching the rotating of a rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes (the objects in the instrument view 174 are preferably capable of being rotated, col. 17, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have used a rotated rendition of the plurality of HMI screen nodes as taught by *Spriggs et al.* with the HMI screen of *Coburn et al.* because *Spriggs et al.* is directed to the same problem of plant management and suggests that the ability to rotate views provides "value" to the user view (*Spriggs et al.*, col. 17, lines 5-10).

As for dependent claim 20, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach receiving from a user a specification of a link from a first HMI screen node to a second HMI screen node the second HMI screen node non-familial to the first HMI screen node. *Spriggs et al.* has been cited for teaching receiving from a user a specification of a link from a first HMI screen node to a second HMI screen node the second HMI screen node non-familial to the first HMI screen node (linking the devices according to a schematic rule set (SRS), where there is no requirement that, the specification only include

familial children para. [0069]). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Spriggs et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 13 above.

As for dependent claim 21, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach rendering a link between two HMI screen nodes. *Spriggs et al.* has been cited for teaching the rendering of a link between two HMI screen nodes (complete schematic illustrating links interconnected. [0069]). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Spriggs et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 13 above.

As for dependent claim 22, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach the rendering of a link from a first HMI screen node to a second HMI screen node the second HMI screen node non-familial to the first HMI screen node. *Spriggs et al.* has been cited for teaching the rendering of a link from a first HMI screen node to a second HMI screen node the second HMI screen node non-familial to the first HMI screen node (See FIG. 103; Note: there is no requirement that HMI linking table 2027 link familial nodes as illustrated in FIG. 103). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Spriggs et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 13 above.

18. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Coburn et al.* in view of *Burbridge et al.* (US 6,965,855 A1).

As to dependent Claim 23, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one HMI screen link. *Burbridge et al.* has been cited for teaching receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control ("...buttons 386, 388, and 390 are programmed using the general programming set of the HMI software program." col.22 lines 10-16) comprising at least one HMI screen link ("...which provide access to another HMI screen," col. 19 lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have used the method of receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one HMI screen link as taught by *Burbridge et al.* with the HMI screen of *Coburn et al.* because *Burbridge et al.* recognizes that "Having the same information stored at multiple locations on the network creates version control problems", (col 1, lines 35-44) and further suggests a method for configuring HMI user screen navigation by providing an HMI screen navigation editor (FIG. 17; graphic screen 290; col. 19, lines 36-38) where receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one HMI screen link is taught as the solution (col. 19, lines 47-50).

As for dependent claim 24, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach the rendering of a navigation control. *Burbridge et al.* has been cited for teaching the rendering of a navigation control (components 292 [including] buttons, col. 19 lines 47-50) comprising at least one HMI screen link ("...which provide access to another HMI screen," col. 19 lines

47-50). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Burbridge et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 23 above.

As for dependent claim 25, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one button. *Burbridge et al.* has been cited for teaching receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one button ("...buttons 386, 388, and 390 are programmed using the general programming set of the HMI software program." col.22 lines 10-16). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Burbridge et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 23 above.

As for dependent claim 26, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach rendering a navigation control comprising at least one button. *Burbridge et al.* has been cited for teaching rendering a navigation control comprising at least one button (components 292 [including] buttons, col. 19 lines 47-50). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Burbridge et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 23 above.

As for dependent claim 27, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one button the at least one

button comprising an HMI screen link. *Burbridge et al.* has been cited for teaching receiving from a user a specification of a navigation control comprising at least one button (See col. 22, lines 10-16, for the programming of buttons using the general programming set of the HMI software program) the at least one button comprising an HMI screen link ("...which provide access to another HMI screen," col. 19 lines 47-50). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Burbridge et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 23 above.

As for dependent claim 28, *Coburn et al.* teaches the same limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. *Coburn et al.* differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to expressly teach rendering a navigation control comprising at least one button the at least one button comprising an HMI screen link. *Burbridge et al.* has been cited for teaching rendering a navigation control (component, col. 19, lines 50-54) comprising at least one button the at least one button comprising an HMI screen link ("...which provide access to another HMI screen," col. 19 lines 47-50). Thus, the combination of *Coburn et al.* and *Burbridge et al.* meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set fourth in the discussion of claim 23 above.

CONCLUSION

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon which considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is now recited: U.S. Patent No. 7,017,116 B2 for teaching a HMI on a portable device, U.S. Patent No. 6,054,986 for teaching the display of HMI objects with functional relations, U.S. Patent No. 6,975,914 B2 for teaching improved methods and apparatus for workflow editing, and U.S. Patent No.

6,754,885 B1 for disclosing a method and apparatus for controlling object appearance in a process control configuration system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samir Termanini whose telephone number is (571) 270-1047. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between the hours of 9:00AM - 4:00PM, excluding alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ST/
June 23, 2006

Samir Termanini
Patent Examiner

CHANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER